



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,211	03/27/2001	Chang-Won Kim	5000-1-176	2480
33942	7590	03/10/2004	EXAMINER	
CHA & REITER, LLC 210 ROUTE 4 EAST STE 103 PARAMUS, NJ 07652			DAVIS, TEMICA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2681	
DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004				

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/818,211	KIM ET AL.
	Examiner Temica M. Davis	Art Unit 2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3-5,7 and 8 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 discusses a plurality of optical transponders, however, claim 7 only discusses a single optical transponder. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bodell, U.S. Patent No. 6,324,391.

Regarding claim 1, Bodell discloses a mobile communication system employing a plurality of digital optical links comprising a base station controller (BSC) (116) for managing overall control within said mobile system, said BSC coupled to a base transceiver system (BTS) via a first E1/T1 link (col. 4, lines 20-28; figures 1 and 2), a BTS controller (122) coupled to said BSC via a second E1/T1 link for managing the channel capacity of a plurality of compact BTSs (col. 4, lines 38-53, col. 5, lines 13-35,

col. 5, lines 46-51; figures 1 and 2), a plurality of optical fiber links coupled to said BTS controller at one end via an optical coupling and the plurality of said compact BTSs at the other end (col. 4, lines 38-61; figures 1 and 2), said plurality of compact BTSs having a plurality of optical transponders (i.e., the repeaters) inherently arranged in space relation with each other along each of said optical links; said optical transponders being operative for inherently receiving an up-link signal at one frequency to be retransmitted as a down-link signal and for amplifying said up-link signal at another frequency to other compact BTS along said optical fiber link (col. 9, lines 22-56).

Regarding claim 2, Bodell discloses the system of claim 1, wherein said downlink signal corresponds to the radio frequency (RF) of said compact BTS, and wherein said amplified up-link signal is forwarded to the RF portion of said other compact BTS disposed along said optical fiber link (col. 9, lines 22-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodell.

Regarding claim 6, Bodell discloses the system of claim 1. Bodell, however, fails to specifically disclose wherein the number of said optical fiber links is limited by the capacity of said BSC.

The examiner contends, however, that such a feature would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the purpose of ensuring that excess links wouldn't be placed in the system if the capacity in a certain geographic was small.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 3-5, 7 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claims 3 and 7, prior art fails to suggest or render obvious the detailed functions of the BTS controller and the optical transponders.

Regarding claims 4, 5 and 8, they are indicated allowable based on their dependency of allowable claims 3 and 7.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Temica M. Davis whose telephone number is (703) 306-5837. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday (alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Erika Gary can be reached on (703) 308-0123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Temica M. Davis
Examiner
Art Unit 2681

TMD
March 7, 2004


TEMICA M. DAVIS
PATENT EXAMINER